

In his speech on the Conciliation of America, Edmund Burke said, "All government, indeed, every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue and every prudent act, is founded on compromise and barter."

The authors of Proposition 60 have compromised too much. They had the chance to permanently protect California's primary system, but stopped short of the goal line.

Proposition 60 does allow parties that have candidates in primary elections to have a candidate in general elections. That's some protection from radical schemes – but not enough.

Proposition 60 doesn't spell out what kind of primary elections California will have.

That leaves the door open for future tinkering with the primary system and still allows the special interest backers of so-called "open primary" or "blanket primary" schemes to come in over and over again with new attempts to try and make changes that would harm our system.

Enough is enough. No political party should be forced to allow members of other parties to choose their nominees.

Proposition 60 could have amended the California constitution to permanently prevent primary schemes from being imposed in the future. It doesn't.

As Californians, we want to see elections constitutionally protected from changes and from the opportunity for mischief.

A think-tank in Washington State, where they have also wrestled with primary election issues, recently noted a survey taken in California when our primary was temporarily changed a few years back. It said 37% of the state's Republicans planned to help determine the Democrat nominee for Governor and 20% of Democrats planned to vote in the Republican primary for Senate.

Proposition 60 could have permanently amended the California constitution to prevent the opportunity for mischief. It doesn't.

Proposition 60 also falls short of the mark when it comes to its second half.

It does make sense to sell surplus state property when we're in the middle of a budget crisis, but Proposition 60 only says that *if* surplus properties are sold then the proceeds can only be spent to pay off the deficit reduction bonds voters approved last March.

It doesn't actually force the sale of the hundreds of millions of dollars worth of surplus property the states owns.

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES

As California's financial troubles have grown, taxpayer groups started putting legislators' feet to the fire to get rid of surplus property the state owns – including a Bay Area massage parlor, part of a golf course, strip malls and fashionable properties in Sausalito and even Tahiti!

Proposition 60 is only half a response.

It's good the big spenders can't get their hands on the proceeds, but there needs to be more of a stick to get the bureaucrats off the dime to actually sell properties.

Proposition 60 does no harm, but voters deserve more. Voters deserve *permanent* protection for our primary system, and voters deserve to see "for sale" signs popping up on the states surplus property.

State Senator Bill Morrow

State Assemblymember Sarah Reyes

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES